

California State University, San Bernardino

**CSUSB ScholarWorks**

---

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

---

1975

## Children's perception of special class labels.

Thomas D. Bohan

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Child Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Bohan, Thomas D., "Children's perception of special class labels." (1975). *Theses Digitization Project*. 68.  
<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/68>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@csusb.edu](mailto:scholarworks@csusb.edu).

CHILDREN'S PERCEPTIONS OF  
SPECIAL CLASS LABELS

---

A Thesis  
Presented to the  
Faculty of  
California State College  
San Bernardino

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts  
in  
Psychology

---

by  
Thomas D. Bohan  
June 1975

CHILDREN'S PERCEPTIONS OF  
SPECIAL CLASS LABELS

---

A Thesis  
Presented to the  
Faculty of  
California State College  
San Bernardino

---

by  
Thomas D. Bohan  
June 1975

---

Approved by:

  
Chairperson

6-9-75  
Date





## ABSTRACT

The present study assessed: (1) The degree of stigma elementary school students attached to special class labels, and (2) differences in self-esteem among regular, learning disability group, and educationally handicapped classes for fourth, fifth, and sixth graders. For regular class children "Educationally Handicapped" was rated significantly more distant from the "Best Child" than was the "Average Child" on a specially designed semantic differential scale. This significant difference in perceived stigma was not found in either the learning disability or the educationally handicapped groups. Although a tendency was found for those students in the two special class groups to be more negative in their evaluation of the concept "Me," these differences did not reach statistical significance. Results are integrated into previous findings on labeling and special class placement.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Review of the Literature.....	2
Labeling.....	2
Self-Esteem.....	3
Special Classes.....	5
EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN AND PROCEDURE.....	9
Subjects.....	9
Materials.....	9
Procedure.....	11
RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS.....	14
Research Questions.....	14
Research Hypotheses.....	14
RESULTS.....	16
DISCUSSION.....	22
.....	
APPENDIX	
A Permission Letter and Authorization Form.....	25
B Scoring Sheets.....	27
C Subjects Definition of Best Child Concept.....	34
D Subjects Definition of Learning Disability Group.....	38
E Subjects Definition of Educationally Handicapped Concept.....	42
F Subjects Definition of Average Child Concepts....	46
G Subjects Definition of Me Concept.....	50
REFERENCES.....	54

## LIST OF TABLES

1.	The Mean Age Level in Months by Class Group and School.....	16
2.	The Mean IQ in Terms of Percentile Ranking by Class Group and Schools.....	17
3.	The Number of Male and Female Subjects by Class Group and School.....	18
4.	The Number of Subjects Classified by Ethnic Background, by Class Groups, and School.....	19
5.	The Mean Distance Between Best Child and Special Class Labels for Regular Class (RC), Learning Disability Group (LDG), and Educationally Handicapped Classes (EH).....	19
6.	Mean Distance Scores Between "Best Child" and "Me" for each of the Class Groupings.....	21

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere thanks is extended to Dr. Stephen Morin whose understanding, insight, and help were invaluable in producing this thesis. Gratitude is also expressed to Dr. Gloria Cowan and Dr. Michael Maskin for their assistance as members of the thesis committee.

Appreciation is expressed to Lydia Sullivan of the Computer Center for her assistance in processing the data and to June Jones for her assistance in preparing the final manuscript.

My loving appreciation is extended to Jill Bohan for her patience, time, and understanding during my graduate training, and particularly during the preparation of this thesis.

## INTRODUCTION

Much research has focused on comparing the educational accomplishments and abilities of our nation's children against those of other nations and individual children within our own nation with each other. One kind of educational program will not suffice for all children; children respond to different materials differently. What will produce insight in one, may merely baffle another. The most commonly stated goal of special education programs is to meet the needs of those children whose requirements (needs) cannot be adequately met in the regular classroom (Baker, 1959; Dunn, 1968; Kirk, 1962).

We have probably all heard one child taunt another on how one is better than the other because he can run faster, his father is bigger, mother is prettier, or he is in a better scholastic group. It is assumed that this last taunt can be extremely harmful to one's self-esteem, especially if the child is a member of an Educationally Handicapped (EH) class or a Learning Disability Group (LDG). Dividing children in school into different classes or groups, according to their speed and ability to assimilate knowledge, is generally assumed to have a negative or adverse effect on self-esteem (Hollinger & Jones, 1970).



It is also generally assumed that change in self-evaluation in one area, such as reading ability, generalize to self-evaluation in other areas (Maehr, Mensing, & Nafzher, 1962; Haas & Maehr, 1965).

The purpose of this study was to determine the connotative and denotative meaning of labels as perceived by the three groups of children assigned to their respective groups based on their class placement by the San Bernardino City School District. The three groups selected were those from regular classes, those from supplemental learning disability groups, and those from self-contained educationally handicapped classes.

### Review of the Literature

#### Labeling

Hollinger and Jones (1970) researched attitudes toward special class labels in a small midwestern community, using the terms "Mentally Retarded" and "Slow Learner." The result revealed little understanding of the meaning of either term, but greater acceptance of the group labeled "Slow Learner." Some of the responses they received were:

Mentally retarded was born that way. He can't help it, but a slow learner just didn't have proper training. . . .A slow learner has a psychological block. He can learn, but the mentally retarded is something else. They can be dangerous. They act slower, can't coordinate their body. Their face is different. But you can't tell a slow learner by looking at them. They are amazingly smart in some ways and slow in others. . . .Definitely a difference. One is



slow to learn. One can't. . . .Mentally retarded can't go to public schools, and a slow learner can. (p. 22)

Meyers and Watts (1966) found that, in general, there is less acceptance of public school responsibility for the Trainable Mental Retardates than there is for the Educable Mental Retardates. Besides people's reluctance to learn about things in which they are not directly involved, this attitude can be compounded by the school's previous reluctance to educate parents. As a consequence, many people believe that these children should not go to public schools and that the public schools should not have provisions for special classes. What has this attitude done to the child when he has been placed into one of these lower groups called special classes? What does this do to the child's self-concept?

### Self-Esteem

According to Rogers (1951), the self-concept is a determiner of behavior and achievement. Williams and Cole (1948) believe that very few factors are more fundamental to a child's success and happiness than his evaluation and acceptance of himself. Over the past twenty odd years, as educators have begun to overcome the attitudes depicted by Meyers and Watts, the need for special classes has been recognized. Consensus in the San Bernardino City Schools is that children should be kept in regular classes whenever

possible. If they are placed in special classes (e.g., EH or LDG), they should be returned to their regular classes as soon as possible. However, as Jones (1972) has found, there is still an underlying lack of attention being given to the stigma associated with these labels. Both labels and special class placement may create problems of lowered self-esteem and interfere with the child's optimum growth and development.

Festinger (1954) has shown that an individual will gravitate toward a group which is similar in important respects for purposes of social comparison. If a child is not conforming to the standards, norms, status, and other criterion of the group, the child begins to be ostracized, thereby forcing the child into conformity to the group. This was found to be true whether the person fell below the norm and was forced to improve, or if the person was better than the group and was forced to stop improving, and perhaps regress back to the group norms. Festinger, Torrey, and Willerman (1954) have found that:

The stronger the attraction of members to a group, the stronger will be the feelings of inadequacy, on the part of those scoring less well than others; and stronger will be the feelings of adequacy on the part of those scoring as well, or better than, the others in the group. (p. 173)

This is further supported by Coopersmith (1967), who has shown that subjects who differ in self-esteem also differ markedly in confidence of success, faith in their judgment,

participation in discussions, novelty and independence of judgment, and ease in forming social relationships. These findings support the interactionist perspective which asserts that the important influences on the self-concept are social ones, and that the important problems are those of learning the social determinants and the social consequences of one's self-concept (Cooley, 1964).

Other studies have also established that groups exert pressure on their members toward uniformity of its norms, such as shown by Sherif (1936), Asch (1940), and Festinger (1950). Rasmussen and Zander (1954) found the group by which a person establishes his self-esteem and aspirations may not be the group to which the individual belongs, e.g., Educationally Handicapped or Learning Disability Group, but the group the individual desires to be in, e.g., Regular Class. If the child feels that the group in which he/she has been placed is not a relevant one, the pressures towards uniformity may have no effect, or may indeed have a negative effect in terms of the self-fulfilling prophecy as demonstrated by Rosenthal and Jacobsen (1968).

### Special Classes

Being placed in a special class gives formal recognition to the fact that the child is a slower than normal learner. This causes deviant action to be taken toward him

on the basis of a new deviant status (Towne & Joiner, 1968). While it is true that all societies develop techniques to suppress deviant behavior, they also create a particular status and/or group where deviant behavior is not only accepted, but is expected and legitimate (Erickson, 1957).

Since being labeled and placed in a special class changes the student's position in the social structure as a whole, it may be expected that this will influence his behavior (Gross, Mason, & McEachern, 1958); thus, the foundation for the self-fulfilling prophecy.

Rasmussen and Zander (1954) have said that persons who are strongly attracted to their group keenly feel pressures to adhere to its standards. Those persons who are unable to meet the group's standards will have greater feelings of failure than they would from a group that is less desirable to them. Deviation from the standards of the group of which one is not a member, but wants membership (e.g., a subject classified as Educationally Handicapped who wants to be a member of the Regular Class), causes greater feelings of failure since the former group (Regular Class) is able to bring its influence to bear more directly upon the individual.

Several authors have suggested a relationship between labeling and social stigma (Guskin, 1963; Clark, 1969; Johnson, 1969), but little research has actually been

reported on the effect of labeling in special education.

Morin, Applegate, Merriman, and Weddington (1974) have investigated the relative degree of perceived stigma attached to various labels. In their study, seven of the labels were selected from the literature on learning disabilities and seven were chosen from state mandated labeling procedures in the state of California. Two additional labels were "average child" and "ideal child" for a total of 16 different class labels. The subjects were 31 student volunteers enrolled in two advanced education classes at California State College, San Bernardino, heterogeneous in age, teaching experience, and exposure to exceptional children. The second sample consisted of 52 undergraduates at Ohio State University enrolled in a beginning psychology course. They were younger, more homogeneous, and had less exposure to exceptional children. A semantic differential scale was specifically developed for the study, and each of the 14 special class labels selected for the study was systematically compared to the nonspecial class labels of "average child" and "ideal child." Morin et al. suggested that additional research should be conducted because differential and additional data is needed to determine the connotative meaning of these special class labels for the teachers of both regular and special classes.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate whether the benefits to children placed in learning



disability classes are reversed by the negative effect of labeling them as having learning disabilities. When a child is labeled by the school as Educationally Handicapped (EH) or Learning Disability Group (LDG), this label may be associated with a lowered self-concept, and the child not learning even when he/she is capable of doing so (Jones, 1972).

## EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

### Subjects

Seventy-five students at four different elementary schools in the San Bernardino City School District were randomly chosen from those schools having Special Education classes for both EH and LDG children. It was felt that this method of sampling would be representative of the San Bernardino City School District. A letter was sent home with the student requesting his/her parents permission for him/her to participate in the study (see Appendix A). Subjects were taken from the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades. Each educational group was matched for IQ and grade levels.

The RC children remained physically together for all of their classes throughout the day. The children from the LDG classroom were separated from the Regular Classroom (RC) children for three hours per day, twice a week, for special classes. Those children grouped in the EH class were segregated from the rest of their classmates of their grade level all day, every day, for special classes, and arrived at school in special buses.

### Materials

A semantic differential scale was used consisting of nine sets of diametrically opposed adjectives used in

reference to five labels. The basis for the children's semantic differential scale is found in the research by Lynch (1972) and Scotti (1972).

Two figurines, one designated male and one female, and a board with five slots within which to place one of the figurines were used. The figurine was made out of wood, cut into silhouette with a dress to designate the female, and the lack of a dress to designate the male. There were no other characteristics on the figurines, facial or otherwise. This was done to prevent the child from responding to the characteristics of the figurines.

Eight-by-five cards were used, each of which had a label or an adjective printed on it. The label the child was to respond to was placed in a stand above the slots within plain view of the subject. One of the nine sets of opposing adjectives was placed in stands on both sides of the slotted board. The polarity of adjectives was randomly assigned; the order of concept was rotated to control for mental set and fatigue.

Each of the special class labels selected for this study was systematically compared to the nonspecial class labels of "Average Child" and "Best Child." A semantic differential scale was specifically developed for this study. The adjectives for this scale were chosen from the results of studies previously completed by Morin, Applegate, Merriman, and Weddington (1974).

Each subject was given the same semantic differential test consisting of the five labels: Educationally Handicapped, Learning Disability, Me, Best Child, and Average Child. Each label was rated on nine adjectives using a five-point semantic differential scale. The adjectives and their order were: Funny-not funny; not believable-believable; liked-not liked; pretty-ugly; loving-not loving; weak-strong; good-bad; dirty-clean; read-not real.

### Procedure

Subjects in the EH, LDG, and Regular Classes were selected to male IQ and grade levels equivalent in groups. Since all of the subjects had not taken the same IQ test, equivalent groups were selected on the basis of IQ's converted to percentile scores. The test took approximately 15 minutes to administer and was conducted in a separate room for this purpose during regular class time. Three of the schools used the open-class method of teaching; the fourth school had a more conventional setting where each classroom of students was separated by walls into individual rooms. The students in this fourth school were still allowed a liberal amount of freedom and movement. It was not unusual for a student to be leaving his group to participate in something else, thus eliminating the concern of the "guinea pig" effect.

The instructions were similar in style to those given

by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1964, p. 82). Subjects were encouraged to respond with first impressions. Each child was guaranteed anonymity in his responses and that his participation in the study would in no way affect his school grade.

Subjects were told as a group and individually that they were assisting the experimenter in finding out how students felt about different words. Each sat next to the experimenter in the testing room facing the slotted board with the figurine matching his/her sex. Each student saw and used only the figurine that matched his or her sex.

The subject was then run through a sample table of the test. The sample table and adjectives selected were chosen because of their lack of likelihood to cause a mental set. The label was Snoopy, and the adjectives were cuddly and not cuddly. After the experimenter placed the words in their respective slots, he said, "First I will show you how to do this, and then it will be your turn." Pointing to the label, the experimenter said, "You show me how you feel about Snoopy by using this figure." Then pointing to the respective adjective, the experimenter said, "Cuddly to not cuddly. Now if you feel that Snoopy is real cuddly, you place the figure here. If you feel he is really not cuddly, here. If in between, here. Now, if you feel Snoopy is not real cuddly, but not quite in between



cuddly and not cuddly, you place the figure here. The same goes for the other side. If you feel Snoopy is not really cuddly, but not in between cuddly and not cuddly either, you would place your figure here. Okay? Do you understand? Good. Now you show me." After pointing to the respective label and adjective and reading them again, the subject was allowed to demonstrate that he had understood the instructions by placing the figurine in a slot appropriate to his feelings.

This procedure of reading each label and adjective and pointing to it at the same time was repeated throughout the test. The subject responded on the basis of how he felt about each label by placing the figurine in the appropriate slot, between the two adjectives.

The experimenter had a scoring sheet on which to record responses. When the subject placed the figurine in the slot to indicate his choice, the experimenter would make a mark on the sheet in the corresponding spot, thus eliminating the differences in the abilities of each subject to make marks on paper in appropriate spaces (see Appendix B).

## RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

### Research Questions

The questions that this research has attempted to answer are the following:

1. Do Regular Class, Learning Disability Group Class, and Educationally Handicapped Class students each differentiate degree of stigma attributed to each special class label?
2. Does placement in a special program change ratings of special class labels in a positive direction?
3. Are there significant differences in levels of self-esteem between those placed in Regular Classes, Learning Disability, and Educationally Handicapped programs?

### Research Hypotheses

1. Each of the special class labels will be significantly more stigmatized than the concept of the average child for each of the three groups (RC, LDG, EH).
2. Degree of stigma attributed to each special class label will be significantly less for the LDG than RC group.
3. The degree of stigma attributed to special class labels will be significantly less for EH group than for either the RC or LDG groups.
4. The level of self-esteem will be significantly

lower for the LDG group than for the RC group.

5. The level of self-esteem for the EH group will be significantly lower than for either the LDG or RC groups.

## RESULTS

Demographic statistics for subjects in this study can be found in Tables 1-4. Table 1 shows the mean age of subjects in months for each educational group at each school. Although fourth, fifth, and sixth grade classes were tested, groups vary in general less than ten months in age across all schools. The only exception to this statistic is the regular class subjects at Bonnie Ole whose mean age is 12.75 months younger than their comparable group at another school. The LDG as a whole was significantly younger than both the Regular Class and the EH class ( $p < .01$ ). This represents a failure to achieve equivalent groups in subject selection.

Table 1  
The Mean Age Level in Months  
by Class Group and School

	Bonnie Ole	Roosevelt	Bradley	Marshall
Educationally Handicapped	138.75	140.5	136.0	134.36
Learning Disability Group	113.25	116.25	123.8	124.0
Regular Classroom	120.0	142.86	139.25	132.75

Table 2 shows the mean percentile IQ ranking for each group in each school. With the exception of the LDG subjects at Bonnie Ole School, all subjects are under the fiftieth percentile. An average IQ range score is necessary for placement in either EH or LDG classes. These scores are used as a guide to give a better picture of the population. The IQ of the LDG was significantly higher than either that of the Regular Class or the EH groups ( $p < .05$ ). Again, this represents a failure to obtain equivalent groups in subject selection.

Table 2

The Mean IQ in Terms of Percentile Ranking  
by Class Group and School

	Bonnie Ole	Roosevelt	Bradley	Marshall
Educationally Handicapped	21.75	19.25	37.0	31.73
Learning Disability Group	61.0	39.25	46.0	35.57
Regular Classroom	32.0	20.43	30.0	36.0

Table 3 shows the number of male and female subjects by class group and school. There were proportionately more boys in EH and LDG classes than girls. Consequently, in matching by sex in the regular class groups, greater



representation was given to male subjects.

Table 3

The Number of Male and Female Subjects  
by Class Group and School

	Bonnie Ole		Roosevelt		Bradley		Marshall	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Educationally Handicapped	5	3	4	0	5	2	9	2
Learning Disability Group	3	1	4	0	5	0	6	1
Regular Classroom	0	2	4	3	6	2	6	2

Table 4 presents classification of subjects by ethnic background for each class group and each school. A higher proportion of Anglo-Saxons were found in each class group and school than either Chicanos or Blacks. Proportions were made equivalent in the three class groupings.

The first hypothesis was tested by taking the distance between "Best Child" and "Average Child" as a pivot and seeing if the two special class labels were significantly more distant from "Best Child" than was the "Average Child."

This index was used as a measure of perceived stigma.

Table 5 shows the mean distance between "Best Child" and the concepts "Average Child," "Learning Disability," and "Educationally Handicapped" for the three groups as well as for all groups combined.

Table 4

The Number of Subjects Classified by Ethnic Background, by Class Group, and School

	Bonnie Ole			Roosevelt			Bradley			Marshall		
	CH	B	AS	CH	B	AS	CH	B	AS	CH	B	AS
Educationally Handicapped	0	0	8	1	2	1	1	2	4	0	2	9
Learning Disability Group	0	1	3	2	2	0	0	2	3	1	1	5
Regular Classroom	1	0	1	2	5	0	1	0	7	1	2	5

CH = Chicanos

B = Blacks

AS = Anglo Saxon

Table 5

The Mean Distance Between Best Child and Special Class Labels for Regular Class (RC), Learning Disability Group (LDG), and Educationally Handicapped Classes (EH)

Concept	RC N = 25	LDG N = 20	EH N = 30	All Groups N = 75
Average Child	3.23	3.45	3.65	3.46
Learning Disability	3.66	3.72	3.74	3.71
Educationally Handicapped	4.10	3.48	3.92	3.87

Support for the first hypothesis was found for the Regular Class group where EH was significantly more stigmatized than Average Child ( $t = 3.03$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and for the same comparison with all groups combined ( $t = 2.12$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The Learning Disability label was not significantly different from that of the "Average Child" for any of the groups. The Educationally Handicapped label was not significantly different from "Average Child" for either of the special class groups.

Hypothesis two was tested by computing a t-test for significance of differences between mean stigma scores of the special class labels for the LDG class compared to the Regular Class group. This difference was not statistically significant, although it was in the expected direction of the hypothesis.

Hypothesis three compared the mean stigma scores of the special class label for the Educationally Handicapped compared to both the Regular Class group and Learning Disability group. Neither of these differences were statistically significant, although again each was in the expected direction of the hypothesis.

The fourth and fifth hypotheses relating to self-esteem were tested by inspecting the mean distance between ratings of the "Best Child" and the concept "Me." The mean distance for each of the class groupings is presented in Table 6. The means were taken as measures of self-esteem

and t-tests for significance of difference between independent samples were computed. None of the groups differed significantly from any of the other groups, although the trend toward lower self-esteem for those in segregated classes was in the predicted direction.

Table 6

Mean Distance Scores Between "Best Child" and  
"Me" for Each of the Class Groupings

Class Groups	Mean D
Regular Class	3.92
Learning Disability Group	3.53
Educationally Handicapped	3.85

## DISCUSSION

The findings, in general, support the prediction that at least children in regular classes attached a significant amount of stigma to the educationally handicapped label. This tendency was also noted in those who had been labeled but the stigma was greatly reduced in these two groups.

The term "Learning Disability" did not appear to carry the degree of stigma that "Educationally Handicapped" did. This was most likely because of both its sounding less bad, and the actuality that such a supplemental class placement generally goes to less academically disabled students than does the segregated special class assignment. These findings are consistent with those of Morin, Applegate, Merri-man, and Weddington (1974).

The notion that those placed in special classes would know more about the labels and therefore have less stigma attached to them was not supported statistically. However, this trend could clearly be seen in the data. With a larger sample and more carefully matched groups, significant differences would most likely emerge. This trend was found in an earlier study with parents of children placed in special classes (Morin, Martinez, & Suckaldowski, 1974).

The hypothesis relating directly to the level of

self-esteem of those placed in special classes demonstrated a trend toward lowered self-esteem in the Learning Disability Group, and especially the Educationally Handicapped Group. However, the power of these differences is much less than might be expected. None of the differences between the groups were statistically significant. More large-scale studies would be likely to pick up these differences. By and large, it does appear that much less stigma is attached to the learning disability terms than to terms reflecting mental retardation or emotional disturbance.

During the course of the experiment it was observed that a misconception regarding the meaning of Educationally Handicapped permeated all groups. Many of the subjects confused the EH children with the physically disabled and/or Mentally Retarded. This is attributed to the fact that the EH children come to school on a bus separating them from all the other children. This is the same as those children who are classified as Mentally Retarded or Physically Handicapped. The net result of this is that the rest of the school does not know whose bus is pulling up. They only know that it is one of those buses with those "different kids."

The responses of each subject when asked to define each term is found in Appendix C through Appendix G. Interjudge reliability in assessing correctness of

definitions of the labels showed a very low level of agreement. Overall, the judges disagreed on 30.4% of the 375 definitions. The highest level of disagreement between the judges was 64% for the LDG concept, and the lowest level of disagreement was 1.3% for the "Best Child" concept. Evidently even the judges have difficulty assessing the meaning of these terms. Since there is such a high level of disagreement between the judges, the raw data of Appendixes C through G have been included to let the reader decide the subject's ability to understand the labels in question.

The problem lies in the children's inability to identify each group as being what it really is. If each of the three groups knew what each one really was, then the EH children would not be made fun of for being retarded. Education, on the meaning of these labels, would likely go a long way toward easing the degree of stigma attached to each special class.



CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE  
SAN BERNARDINO

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

APPENDIX A

Permission Letter and Authorization Form

Dear Parent:

The Department of Psychology at California State College, San Bernardino is conducting a study funded by the National Science Foundation to determine how elementary school students feel about words. This research project has the approval and cooperation of the San Bernardino City School District.

We need your signature on the enclosed form in order that we may use your child in this study. It will take only 10 to 15 minutes of your child's time and will be conducted at his school. The information gathered on your child will be used for research purposes only. The research is designed to suggest improvements in teaching.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Stephen F. Morin".

Stephen F. Morin, Ph.D.  
Assistant Professor  
of Psychology

SFM:cj

If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Morin at 887-6311 - Ext. 231 or 480 or one of his assistants.



Please return this form with your child to school.

I grant permission for my child \_\_\_\_\_  
(child's name)

to participate in the Research study being conducted by  
members of the Psychology Department at California State  
College, San Bernardino.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Parent or  
Guardian

**APPENDIX B**

**Scoring Sheets**

**NAME:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SEX:** \_\_\_\_\_

**AGE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**I.Q.:** \_\_\_\_\_

**CULTURAL BACKGROUND:** \_\_\_\_\_

## EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED

FUNNY

\_\_\_\_\_

NOT FUNNY

NOT BELIEVABLE

\_\_\_\_\_

BELIEVABLE

LIKED

\_\_\_\_\_

NOT LIKED

PRETTY

\_\_\_\_\_

UGLY

LOVING

\_\_\_\_\_

NOT LOVING

WEAK

\_\_\_\_\_

STRONG

GOOD

\_\_\_\_\_

BAD

DIRTY

\_\_\_\_\_

CLEAN

REAL

\_\_\_\_\_

NOT REAL

## LEARNING DISABILITY

FUNNY

---

---

---

---

---

NOT FUNNY

NOT BELIEVABLE

---

---

---

---

---

BELIEVABLE

LIKED

---

---

---

---

---

NOT LIKED

PRETTY

---

---

---

---

---

UGLY

LOVING

---

---

---

---

---

NOT LOVING

WEAK

---

---

---

---

---

STRONG

GOOD

---

---

---

---

---

BAD

DIRTY

---

---

---

---

---

CLEAN

REAL

---

---

---

---

---

NOT REAL

ME

FUNNY

\_\_\_\_\_

NOT FUNNY

NOT BELIEVABLE

\_\_\_\_\_

BELIEVABLE

LIKED

\_\_\_\_\_

NOT LIKED

PRETTY

\_\_\_\_\_

UGLY

LOVING

\_\_\_\_\_

NOT LOVING

WEAK

\_\_\_\_\_

STRONG

GOOD

\_\_\_\_\_

BAD

DIRTY

\_\_\_\_\_

CLEAN

REAL

\_\_\_\_\_

NOT REAL

## BEST CHILD

FUNNY

\_\_\_\_\_

NOT FUNNY

NOT BELIEVABLE

\_\_\_\_\_

BELIEVABLE

LIKED

\_\_\_\_\_

NOT LIKED

PRETTY

\_\_\_\_\_

UGLY

LOVING

\_\_\_\_\_

NOT LOVING

WEAK

\_\_\_\_\_

STRONG

GOOD

\_\_\_\_\_

BAD

DIRTY

\_\_\_\_\_

CLEAN

REAL

\_\_\_\_\_

NOT REAL

## AVERAGE CHILD

FUNNY

\_\_\_\_\_

NOT FUNNY

NOT BELIEVABLE

\_\_\_\_\_

BELIEVABLE

LIKED

\_\_\_\_\_

NOT LIKED

PRETTY

\_\_\_\_\_

UGLY

LOVING

\_\_\_\_\_

NOT LOVING

WEAK

\_\_\_\_\_

STRONG

GOOD

\_\_\_\_\_

BAD

DIRTY

\_\_\_\_\_

CLEAN

REAL

\_\_\_\_\_

NOT REAL

Tell me what you think the following words mean?

What are their definitions?

Best Child:

LEARNING DISABILITY:

EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED:

AVERAGE CHILD:

ME:



## APPENDIX C

### Subjects Definition of Best Child Concept

LEARNING DISABILITY GROUP		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>1</sub>	best friend	Y	Y
S <sub>2</sub>	he's good	Y	Y
S <sub>3</sub>	he's good	Y	Y
S <sub>12</sub>	in the family, strongest	Y	Y
S <sub>13</sub>	being good in classroom and at home	N	Y
S <sub>14</sub>	being good	N	Y
S <sub>15</sub>	good	N	Y
S <sub>42</sub>	nobody in the class who's good and best	N	Y
S <sub>43</sub>	real super good	Y	Y
S <sub>44</sub>	doesn't get in a lot of trouble and doesn't do anything bad	N	Y
S <sub>45</sub>	good/he's best	Y	Y
S <sub>46</sub>	when they're good	N	Y
S <sub>51</sub>	he's good, stays clean	N	Y
S <sub>62</sub>	really good	N	Y
S <sub>65</sub>	child that don't act up	N	Y
S <sub>66</sub>	good	N	Y
S <sub>70</sub>	they're pretty good	N	Y
S <sub>71</sub>	a good child	N	Y
S <sub>73</sub>	good	N	Y

LEARNING DISABILITY GROUP  
(Continued)

		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>75</sub>	knows everything	N	Y

EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED SUBJECTS

		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>4</sub>	good and not bad	N	Y
S <sub>5</sub>	he's good	N	Y
S <sub>6</sub>	to a parent it's their best child and to someone it's just they don't know/smart child	Y	Y
S <sub>7</sub>	good child/best child in class	Y	Y
S <sub>8</sub>	don't get in no fights, stays clean	N	Y
S <sub>9</sub>	someone that's better than the others	Y	Y
S <sub>10</sub>	he's good, he do good	N	Y
S <sub>11</sub>	a baby boy	N	N
S <sub>16</sub>	the goodest one in the class	Y	Y
S <sub>17</sub>	in a class is the one who is the best reader, speller and behaving	Y	Y
S <sub>24</sub>	good child, learning from good schools	N	Y
S <sub>27</sub>	best one in the class in everything	Y	Y
S <sub>28</sub>	good	N	Y
S <sub>29</sub>	the goodest kid in the class	Y	Y
S <sub>30</sub>	I am	N	N
S <sub>31</sub>	the goodest kid	Y	Y
S <sub>37</sub>	he can do things good and better than the other guys can and does what he's told by his mother and dad	N	Y
S <sub>38</sub>	kind and generous	N	Y

EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED SUBJECTS  
(Continued)

		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>48</sub>	he's good/I like	N	Y
S <sub>55</sub>	good	N	Y
S <sub>56</sub>	he's good, doesn't get in trouble	N	Y
S <sub>57</sub>	he or she is the best one a person knows	Y	N
S <sub>58</sub>	no one's perfect	N	N
S <sub>59</sub>	good, does his work properly	N	Y
S <sub>60</sub>	good behavior, sits still	N	Y
S <sub>61</sub>	good child	N	Y
S <sub>64</sub>	no	N	N
S <sub>68</sub>	nice, truthful, pretty	N	Y
S <sub>69</sub>	good in school and gets everything right and doesn't cause fights	N	Y
S <sub>74</sub>	doesn't get in trouble, good and nice and polite	N	Y

REGULAR CLASSROOM SUBJECTS

		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>18</sub>	good, not goof off	N	Y
S <sub>19</sub>	always good	N	Y
S <sub>20</sub>	good	N	Y
S <sub>21</sub>	he's good and does work	N	Y
S <sub>22</sub>	he's good and does good	Y	N
S <sub>23</sub>	he's best in everything except sports	N	N
S <sub>25</sub>	think, sometimes good	N	Y
S <sub>26</sub>	good, learns	N	Y
S <sub>32</sub>	good, kind	N	Y

REGULAR CLASSROOM SUBJECTS (Continued)		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>33</sub>	perfect	Y	Y
S <sub>34</sub>	know such thing, if there was they would be real good/wouldn't cuss	N	N
S <sub>35</sub>	somebody who's really good	Y	Y
S <sub>36</sub>	the smartest	Y	Y
S <sub>39</sub>	good behaving	N	Y
S <sub>40</sub>	snobby	N	N
S <sub>41</sub>	one that behaves	N	Y
S <sub>47</sub>	good girl	N	Y
S <sub>49</sub>	best in the class	Y	Y
S <sub>50</sub>	do best on work	Y	Y
S <sub>52</sub>	nice and loving	N	Y
S <sub>53</sub>	real good child	N	Y
S <sub>54</sub>	he's good	N	Y
S <sub>63</sub>	doesn't goof around everytime the teacher says something	N	Y
S <sub>67</sub>	good	N	Y
S <sub>72</sub>	good in the class	N	Y

## APPENDIX D

### Subjects Definition of Learning Disability Concept

LEARNING DISABILITY GROUP SUBJECTS		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>1</sub>	not sure of something, don't do too good in such and such as me	Y	N
S <sub>2</sub>	by learning	N	N
S <sub>3</sub>	good/don't know	N	N
S <sub>12</sub>	smart	N	N
S <sub>13</sub>	can't stay up with their class	Y	N
S <sub>14</sub>	not throwing ball when somebody's not looking	N	N
S <sub>15</sub>	you have to learn, don't play only learn	N	N
S <sub>42</sub>	when you learn about something that's good/somebody that has trouble learning and they have to learn a lot	Y	N
S <sub>43</sub>	good/rules around the house	N	N
S <sub>44</sub>	having trouble with work like I am sometimes	Y	N
S <sub>45</sub>	to learn	N	N
S <sub>46</sub>	when they don't read too good	Y	N
S <sub>51</sub>	something is stopping him from doing his work	Y	N
S <sub>62</sub>	people who need to learn	Y	N
S <sub>65</sub>	learning your manners	N	N
S <sub>66</sub>	teacher	N	N

LEARNING DISABILITY GROUP SUBJECTS  
(Continued)

		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>70</sub>	kind of easy and kind of hard	N	N
S <sub>71</sub>	have to learn stuff	N	N
S <sub>73</sub>	don't know/loving	N	N
S <sub>75</sub>	he can't do math or something like that and he has to go to a special class like I am	Y	N

EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED SUBJECTS

		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>4</sub>	you learn and you do things	Y	N
S <sub>5</sub>	learn something good	Y	N
S <sub>6</sub>	learning	N	N
S <sub>7</sub>	doesn't understand	N	N
S <sub>8</sub>	knows all his work in school and minds his mother	N	N
S <sub>9</sub>	to learn	N	N
S <sub>10</sub>	reading books	N	N
S <sub>11</sub>	someone trying to teach you something	N	N
S <sub>16</sub>	hard to remember and work and stuff	Y	N
S <sub>17</sub>	people who have a problem learning, that's why a LDG class	Y	N
S <sub>24</sub>	don't know how to do their work and math and stuff	Y	N
S <sub>27</sub>	somebody has a learning problem/can't sit still in class	N	N
S <sub>28</sub>	like it/nice	N	N
S <sub>29</sub>	they have trouble learning their work	Y	N
S <sub>30</sub>	it's all right	N	N

EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED SUBJECTS  
(Continued)

		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>31</sub>	ain't too good in something	Y	N
S <sub>37</sub>	learns to obey olders and not to do wrong	N	N
S <sub>38</sub>	it's hard for them to learn	Y	N
S <sub>48</sub>	I learn them, like doing your work at school and home	N	N
S <sub>55</sub>	good, but just a little bad	N	N
S <sub>56</sub>	when you're learning to do what you want to do	N	N
S <sub>57</sub>	learning what's good or what's bad	N	N
S <sub>58</sub>	teaching him how to behave and not be spoiled	N	N
S <sub>59</sub>	good/willing to do	N	N
S <sub>60</sub>	learning to read or write	N	N
S <sub>61</sub>	little lot	N	N
S <sub>64</sub>	no	N	N
S <sub>68</sub>	doing its work for example cleaning its house	N	N
S <sub>69</sub>	learning how to be nice and polite to other people	N	N
S <sub>74</sub>	when he learns he grows up he'll know it all	N	N

REGULAR CLASSROOM SUBJECTS

		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>18</sub>	can't learn too well	Y	N
S <sub>20</sub>	slow	Y	N
S <sub>21</sub>	can't do his work right or just hardly learning	Y	N

REGULAR CLASSROOM SUBJECTS (Continued)		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>22</sub>	learning to do so act right in school	N	N
S <sub>23</sub>	can't learn as fast as others	Y	N
S <sub>25</sub>	can't really learn	N	N
S <sub>26</sub>	when you learn a lot and good in class	N	N
S <sub>32</sub>	behave in class/do my work	N	N
S <sub>33</sub>	disability to learn	Y	N
S <sub>34</sub>	need help on their work	Y	N
S <sub>35</sub>	not able to do it just right	Y	N
S <sub>36</sub>	not to understand, that is he doesn't understand in school	Y	N
S <sub>39</sub>	behaving	N	N
S <sub>40</sub>	to learn	N	N
S <sub>41</sub>	that's as much as they think he can do	N	N
S <sub>47</sub>	learn how to do your work	N	N
S <sub>49</sub>	don't understand too good	Y	N
S <sub>50</sub>	not listening/get into trouble	N	N
S <sub>52</sub>	in between, like he has to learn a little more than he could	N	N
S <sub>53</sub>	someone who studies in their book, it help them to read	N	N
S <sub>54</sub>	he's good	N	N
S <sub>63</sub>	need to understand a little bit more	N	N
S <sub>67</sub>	half good and half bad	N	N
S <sub>72</sub>	some kids are bad and good behavior wise	N	N



## APPENDIX E

### Subjects Definition of Educationally Handicapped Concepts

LEARNING DISABILITY GROUP SUBJECTS		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>1</sub>	that you don't get along with education-ally	Y	N
S <sub>2</sub>	don't know	N	N
S <sub>3</sub>	learning, helping out	N	N
S <sub>12</sub>	smart, brave	N	N
S <sub>13</sub>	don't know	N	N
S <sub>14</sub>	somebody like crippled	N	N
S <sub>15</sub>	good	N	N
S <sub>42</sub>	somebody that's handicapped, crippled	N	N
S <sub>43</sub>	sort of good	N	N
S <sub>44</sub>	needs help in a certain number of things	Y	Y
S <sub>45</sub>	good and special boy	N	N
S <sub>46</sub>	most so good when there is something wrong with them	Y	Y
S <sub>51</sub>	good, lovable, crippled	N	N
S <sub>62</sub>	people that need help	Y	Y
S <sub>65</sub>	person that's crippled and educated	N	N
S <sub>66</sub>	he's pretty	N	N
S <sub>70</sub>	he's o.k./they're stupid/I like some of them	Y	N
S <sub>71</sub>	crippled	N	N

LEARNING DISABILITY GROUP SUBJECTS  
(Continued)

		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>73</sub>	clean	N	N
S <sub>75</sub>	if he's in a class he doesn't know everything and sometimes he has to go to a special class	Y	Y

EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED SUBJECTS

		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>4</sub>	I don't know	N	N
S <sub>5</sub>	somebody that needs help	Y	Y
S <sub>6</sub>	people with a handicap	N	N
S <sub>7</sub>	they can't walk	N	N
S <sub>8</sub>	kids handicapped/got things over their legs	N	N
S <sub>9</sub>	to learn to read and write and math and all that	N	Y
S <sub>10</sub>	bad	N	N
S <sub>11</sub>	doesn't mean nothing, not too good, try to help you but	N	N
S <sub>16</sub>	have trouble learning	Y	N
S <sub>17</sub>	people who have a problem with some part of their body or have a handicap with reading	Y	N
S <sub>24</sub>	we can't get along with other kids	Y	N
S <sub>27</sub>	somebody has a learning problem/can't sit still in class	Y	Y
S <sub>28</sub>	pretty good	N	N
S <sub>29</sub>	kids that need help	Y	Y
S <sub>30</sub>	all right, the work is funner	N	N
S <sub>31</sub>	messed up	Y	N

EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED SUBJECTS  
(Continued)

		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>37</sub>	he can't walk and in a wheel chair and people have to help him push	N	N
S <sub>38</sub>	helpless	N	N
S <sub>48</sub>	they're nice, don't like other people talking about them, it's not funny to be handicapped	N	N
S <sub>55</sub>	kind of bad with their body, can't walk	N	N
S <sub>56</sub>	slow and can't write real fast	Y	Y
S <sub>57</sub>	someone who has a problem, math or behind in certain subjects or all of them	Y	Y
S <sub>58</sub>	kind of crippled	N	N
S <sub>59</sub>	not willing to do things, bad	N	N
S <sub>60</sub>	crippled like a broken arm	N	N
S <sub>61</sub>	don't know	N	N
S <sub>64</sub>	don't know	N	N
S <sub>68</sub>	not funny, not happy, something wrong with it	N	N
S <sub>69</sub>	they're in a special class and get to do stuff kids in a regular class don't	Y	N
S <sub>74</sub>	like crippled with braces	N	N

REGULAR CLASSROOM SUBJECTS

		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>18</sub>	handicapped, but he's smart	N	N
S <sub>19</sub>	can't learn too well	Y	Y
S <sub>20</sub>	can't walk	N	N
S <sub>21</sub>	he doesn't do that good	Y	Y
S <sub>22</sub>	smart but handicapped, crippled or something	N	N

REGULAR CLASSROOM SUBJECTS  
(Continued)

		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>23</sub>	can't learn as fast as others	Y	Y
S <sub>25</sub>	hard for them to learn and can't do as good as the others	Y	Y
S <sub>26</sub>	sort of crippled and can't do anything/ don't learn on much as a school child	Y	Y
S <sub>32</sub>	kind too/get out of school	N	N
S <sub>33</sub>	sort of good	N	N
S <sub>34</sub>	they need care, some are part blind	Y	N
S <sub>35</sub>	somebody who ain't just right	Y	N
S <sub>36</sub>	problem, for example birth defect	N	N
S <sub>39</sub>	learning how to do stuff	N	N
S <sub>40</sub>	in between smart and not smart	Y	N
S <sub>41</sub>	that's the way he was taught	N	N
S <sub>47</sub>	real good	N	N
S <sub>50</sub>	doesn't do his work because it isn't fun	Y	N
S <sub>52</sub>	if he was wounded or something	N	N
S <sub>53</sub>	someone who can't walk or something	N	N
S <sub>54</sub>	that they don't like them/not funny	N	N
S <sub>63</sub>	can't understand	Y	Y
S <sub>67</sub>	good, no education	N	N
S <sub>72</sub>	boy doesn't like him	N	N

## APPENDIX F

### Subjects Definition of Average Child Concepts

LEARNING DISABILITY GROUP SUBJECTS		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>1</sub>	not too good of a child	Y	N
S <sub>2</sub>	he's average	Y	N
S <sub>3</sub>	old	N	N
S <sub>12</sub>	nice	Y	N
S <sub>13</sub>	without learning disability, nothing wrong	Y	Y
S <sub>14</sub>	does something and not everything	Y	Y
S <sub>15</sub>	bad child-learn	N	N
S <sub>42</sub>	somebody who doesn't have not too good grades	Y	Y
S <sub>43</sub>	good	Y	N
S <sub>44</sub>	some are best child but gets in trouble sometimes	Y	Y
S <sub>45</sub>	just a child	Y	Y
S <sub>46</sub>	they're in between good and bad	Y	Y
S <sub>51</sub>	good sometimes	Y	Y
S <sub>62</sub>	medium	Y	Y
S <sub>65</sub>	in between, acts up and doesn't	Y	Y
S <sub>66</sub>	he's fine	Y	N
S <sub>70</sub>	plays a lot like me	Y	N
S <sub>71</sub>	a normal child	Y	Y

LEARNING DISABILITY GROUP SUBJECTS  
(Continued)

		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>73</sub>	good	Y	N
S <sub>75</sub>	just good, nothing wrong with him	Y	N

EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED SUBJECTS

		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>4</sub>	I don't know	N	N
S <sub>5</sub>	sometimes good and sometimes bad	Y	Y
S <sub>6</sub>	he ain't going so good in school or he isn't so old	N	N
S <sub>7</sub>	good and bad	Y	Y
S <sub>8</sub>	like somebody care for him, people like them	Y	N
S <sub>9</sub>	regular child goes to regular school	Y	Y
S <sub>10</sub>	clean	Y	N
S <sub>11</sub>	just a kid that's normal	Y	Y
S <sub>16</sub>	good and bad sometimes	Y	Y
S <sub>17</sub>	can spell words out good and some not so good/same for math	Y	Y
S <sub>24</sub>	Schools are trying to teach them	N	N
S <sub>27</sub>	in the middle and between good and bad	Y	Y
S <sub>28</sub>	nice, like average people	Y	N
S <sub>29</sub>	the one that's in the middle	Y	Y
S <sub>30</sub>	all right, not bad	Y	N
S <sub>31</sub>	not too average	Y	N
S <sub>37</sub>	half the time he's "A" and the other half he gets "B's" and "C's" and learns how to look up words he doesn't know in the dictionary	Y	N

EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED SUBJECTS  
(Continued)

		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>38</sub>	normal child	Y	Y
S <sub>48</sub>	smart	N	N
S <sub>55</sub>	good	Y	N
S <sub>56</sub>	like when he's in the 5th grade and doing average work	Y	N
S <sub>57</sub>	kids that are in between all the way such as bad, not bad	Y	Y
S <sub>58</sub>	he's o.k., nothing wrong with him, just a normal boy	Y	Y
S <sub>59</sub>	pretty good	Y	N
S <sub>60</sub>	lazy	N	N
S <sub>61</sub>	in between	Y	Y
S <sub>64</sub>	no	N	N
S <sub>68</sub>	good, not good or bad	N	Y
S <sub>69</sub>	can't do everything he wants to do	N	N
S <sub>74</sub>	smarter than another bear, Yogi Bear	N	N

REGULAR CLASSROOM SUBJECTS

		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>18</sub>	in between smart and not smart/ditto of good and bad	Y	Y
S <sub>19</sub>	not bad, not always good	Y	Y
S <sub>20</sub>	in the middle	Y	Y
S <sub>21</sub>	average in work and stuff	Y	N
S <sub>22</sub>	middle stage, just good in everything	Y	Y
S <sub>23</sub>	middle in everything	Y	Y
S <sub>25</sub>	they're kind and sometimes bad and mean	Y	N

REGULAR CLASSROOM SUBJECTS (Continued)		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>26</sub>	learns a little bit and a little unfair on recess	Y	N
S <sub>32</sub>	kind	Y	N
S <sub>33</sub>	he's good	Y	N
S <sub>34</sub>	not a good child, how high they can get	N	N
S <sub>35</sub>	in between	Y	Y
S <sub>36</sub>	normal	Y	Y
S <sub>39</sub>	do pretty good	Y	N
S <sub>40</sub>	average	Y	N
S <sub>41</sub>	behaves sometimes and sometimes not/ about average	Y	Y
S <sub>47</sub>	half good and bad	Y	Y
S <sub>49</sub>	not bad and not real good	Y	Y
S <sub>50</sub>	do things kind of right	Y	N
S <sub>52</sub>	in between	Y	Y
S <sub>53</sub>	that she's good	Y	N
S <sub>54</sub>	they're good not funny	N	N
S <sub>63</sub>	bad and sometimes not	Y	Y
S <sub>67</sub>	half and half, good and half bad	Y	Y
S <sub>72</sub>	some right and some wrong	N	Y



## APPENDIX G

### Subjects Definition of Me Concept

LEARNING DISABILITY GROUP SUBJECTS		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>1</sub>	myself	Y	Y
S <sub>2</sub>	me, person	Y	Y
S <sub>3</sub>	I don't know	N	N
S <sub>12</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>13</sub>	same thing that says me	Y	Y
S <sub>14</sub>	being good, me	Y	Y
S <sub>15</sub>	good, myself	Y	Y
S <sub>42</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>43</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>44</sub>	me, a person	Y	Y
S <sub>45</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>46</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>51</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>62</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>65</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>66</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>70</sub>	me, play ping pong	Y	Y
S <sub>71</sub>	myself	Y	Y
S <sub>73</sub>	clean, me	Y	Y
S <sub>75</sub>	me	Y	Y

## EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED SUBJECTS

		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>4</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>5</sub>	is the best	Y	Y
S <sub>6</sub>	a work used in read - me	Y	Y
S <sub>7</sub>	not so good, me	Y	Y
S <sub>8</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>9</sub>	plain person, me	Y	Y
S <sub>10</sub>	you or me	Y	Y
S <sub>11</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>16</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>17</sub>	talking about self	Y	Y
S <sub>24</sub>	myself	Y	Y
S <sub>27</sub>	me, I	Y	Y
S <sub>28</sub>	me, the way I feel	Y	Y
S <sub>29</sub>	myself	Y	Y
S <sub>30</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>31</sub>	me, myself	Y	Y
S <sub>37</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>38</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>48</sub>	I am	Y	Y
S <sub>55</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>56</sub>	me and someone else	Y	Y
S <sub>57</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>58</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>59</sub>	me, bad	Y	Y

EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED SUBJECTS  
(Continued)

		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>60</sub>	boy, me	Y	Y
S <sub>61</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>64</sub>	myself	Y	Y
S <sub>68</sub>	me, mean	Y	Y
S <sub>69</sub>	me, can read and watch T.V.	Y	Y
S <sub>74</sub>	me	Y	Y

REGULAR CLASSROOM SUBJECTS

		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>18</sub>	yourself	Y	Y
S <sub>19</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>20</sub>	you	Y	Y
S <sub>21</sub>	myself	Y	Y
S <sub>22</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>23</sub>	average little me	Y	Y
S <sub>25</sub>	good and bad, me	Y	Y
S <sub>26</sub>	I learn a little bit and kind of cheat at recess	N	Y
S <sub>32</sub>	myself	Y	Y
S <sub>33</sub>	I am smart	Y	Y
S <sub>34</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>35</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>36</sub>	myself	Y	Y
S <sub>39</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>40</sub>	me	Y	Y

REGULAR CLASSROOM SUBJECTS  
(Continued)

		JUDGES	
		<u>No. 1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>
S <sub>41</sub>	me and you	Y	Y
S <sub>47</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>49</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>50</sub>	funny, me	Y	Y
S <sub>52</sub>	me - a lovable person	Y	Y
S <sub>53</sub>	it me	Y	Y
S <sub>54</sub>	me	Y	Y
S <sub>63</sub>	me, I'm all right	Y	Y
S <sub>67</sub>	me, half and half	Y	Y
S <sub>72</sub>	me	Y	Y

## REFERENCES

- Ash, S. E. Studies in the principles of judgments and attitudes: Determination of judgments by group and ego standards. Journal of Social Psychology, 1940, 12, 431-435.
- Baker, H. J. Introduction to exceptional children. New York: Mac Millian, 1959.
- Clark, K. B. Learning obstacles among children. In A. L. Roaden (Ed.), Problems of school men in depressed urban centers. Columbus, Ohio: College of Education, The Ohio State University, 1969.
- Cooley, C. H. Human nature and the social order. New York: Schocken, 1964.
- Coopersmith, S. Antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1967.
- Dunn, L. M. Special education for the mildly retarded - is much of it justifiable? Exceptional Child, 1968, 35, 5-24.
- Erickson, K. T. Patient role and social uncertainty - A dilemma of the mentally ill. Psychology, 1957, 20, 263-274.
- Festinger, L. Theory and experiment in social communication. Ann Arbor: Edward Brothers, 1950.
- Festinger, L. A theory of social comparison processes. Human Relations, 1954, 7, 117-140.
- Festinger, L., Torrey, J., & Willerman, B. Self-evaluation as a function to the group. Human Relations, 1954, 7, 161-174.
- Gross, N., Mason, W. S., & McEachern, A. W. Explorations in role analysis. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Guskin, S. L. Dimensions of judge similarity among deviant types. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1963, 68, 218-224.

- Haas, H. I., & Haehr, M. L. Two experiments on the concept of self and the reaction of others. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 100-105.
- Hollinger, C., & Jones, R. L. Community attitude toward slow learners and mental retardates: What's in a name? Mental Retardation, 1970, 8, 37-43.
- Johnson, J. J. Special education and the inner city: A challenge for the future of another means of cooling the mark out? Journal of Special Education, 1969, 3, 241-251.
- Jones, R. L. Labels and stigma in special education. Exceptional Children, 1972, 38(7), 553-564.
- Jones, R. L. Correlates of orthopedically disabled school children's school achievement and interpersonal relationships. Rehabilitation Literature, 1974, 35(9), 272-274, 288.
- Jones, R. L. The hierarchical structure of attitudes toward the exceptional. Exceptional Children, 1974, 40(6), 430-435.
- Kirk, S. A. Educating exceptional children. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1962.
- Laing, A. F., & Chazan, M. Sociometric groupings among educationally subnormal children. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1966, 71(1), 73-77.
- Lynch, M. D. Multidimensional measurement with the "D" statistic and the semantic differential. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Research Association, Chicago, April, 1972.
- Maehr, M. L., Mensing, J., & Nafzher, S. Concept of self and the reaction of others. Sociometry, 1962, 25, 353-357.
- Meyers, C. E., & Watts, C. A. Attitudes toward special education and the handicapped in two community groups. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1966, 71, 78-84.
- Morin, S. F., Applegate, R. L., Merriman, P. S., & Weddington, M. J. Special class labels and stigma: An evaluation of school mandated euphemisms. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Reserve Association, Chicago, April, 1974.

- Morin, S., Martinez, S., & Suckaldowski, T. Parent's perception of special class labels. Unpublished paper, California State College, San Bernardino, 1974.
- Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. The Measurement of meaning. Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1964.
- Rasmussen, G., & Zander, A. Group membership and self-evaluation. Human Relations, 1954, 7, 239-251.
- Rogers, C. R. Client-centered therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951.
- Rosenthal, R., & Jacobsen, L. F. Pygmatation in the classroom. New York: Hold, Rinehart, & Winston, Incorporated, 1968.
- Schurr, K. T., Joiner, L. M., & Twone, R. C. Self-concept research on the mentally retarded: A review of empirical studies. Mental Retardation, 1970, 8(5), 39-43.
- Scotti, R. Semantic differential scales for indexing at elementary grade levels. Paper read at the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 3-7, 1972.
- Sherif, M. The psychology of social norms. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1936.
- Towne, R. C., & Joiner, L. M. Some negative implications of special placement for children with learning disabilities. The Journal of Special Education, 1968, 2(1), 217-222.